



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,776	09/29/2003	Nayel Saleh	6065-88618	2480
24628	7590	08/12/2005	EXAMINER	
WELSH & KATZ, LTD 120 S RIVERSIDE PLAZA 22ND FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606			ELAHEE, MD S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2645	

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/673,776	SALEH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Md S. Elahee	2645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-6 and 9-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ramey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,128).

Regarding claims 1 and 13, Ramey teaches receiving a message having contact information (col.4, lines 59-64, col.5, lines 15-22, 53-56).

Ramey further teaches converting the contact information to contact data having a predetermined searchable format (col.4, lines 59-64, col.5, lines 15-22, 53-64).

Ramey further teaches storing the contact data (col.4, lines 62-64, col.5, lines 15-22).

Ramey further teaches searching the stored contact data (fig.3; col.5, lines 53-64).

Ramey further teaches the contact data is searched for at least one item of information (col.5, lines 53-64).

Regarding claims 2, 10 and 14, Ramey teaches that the message is a voice message, and wherein the voice message is inherently packetized to thereby convert contact information in the voice message to contact data (abstract; fig.2, 4; col.4, lines 59-64).

Regarding claims 3, 11 and 15, Ramey teaches that the message is a voice message, and wherein the voice message is converted to digitized [i.e., text] as the contact data (col.4, lines 59-64).

Art Unit: 2645

Regarding claims 4, 12 and 16, Ramey teaches that the message is a voice message, and wherein the voice message is packetized, and wherein the packetized voice message is converted to text as the contact data (abstract; fig.2, 4; col.4, lines 59-64, col.7, line 64- col.8, line 15).

Regarding claims 5 and 17, Ramey teaches that the system has at least one agent, and wherein the method further comprises providing at least one plug-in that implements conversion and storing of contact data in the communication system (abstract; fig.2, 4; col.4, lines 59-64, col.7, line 64- col.8, line 15). (Note; agents are software routines and algorithms)

Ramey further teaches assigning inherently the at least one plug-in to the agent (abstract; fig.2, 4; col.4, lines 59-64, col.7, line 64- col.8, line 15).

Ramey further teaches activating the at least one plug-in for the agent when a message having contact information is received at the communication system (abstract; fig.2, 4; col.4, lines 59-64, col.7, line 64- col.8, line 15).

Regarding claims 6 and 18, Ramey teaches that the communication system has a plurality of agents and a plurality of plug-ins, and wherein the method further comprises determining inherently for a respective agent of the plurality of agents the at least one plug-in, which is assigned to the respective agent (abstract; fig.2, 4; col.4, lines 59-64, col.5, lines 15-22, 53-64, col.7, line 64- col.8, line 15). (Note; agents are software routines and algorithms)

Regarding claim 9 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 5 and 6. Furthermore, Ramey teaches a plurality of format conversion plug-ins (abstract; fig.2, 4; col.4, lines 59-64, col.7, line 64- col.8, line 15).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Art Unit: 2645

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,128) in view of Holmes, JR. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0138296).

Regarding claims 7 and 19, Ramey further teaches activating the plug-in for the agent (abstract; fig.2, 4; col.4, lines 59-64, col.7, line 64- col.8, line 15). However, Ramey does not specifically teach “the agent logs onto the communication system”. Holmes teaches that the agent logs onto the communication system (page 6, paragraph 0075). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ramey to allow the agent logging onto the communication system as taught by Holmes. The motivation for the modification is to provide status of agent.

6. Claims 8 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,128) in view of Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,813,349).

Art Unit: 2645

Regarding claims 8 and 20, Ramey does not specifically teach "the communication system is an automatic call distribution system". Johnson teaches that the communication system is an automatic call distribution system (abstract; fig.1-3). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ramey to incorporate the communication system being an automatic call distribution system as taught by Johnson. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to connect a caller to one of a plurality of agents in order to meet caller's need.

### *Conclusion*

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Shibuya (U.S. Patent No. 6,847,703) teach Portable communication terminal and communication service system.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Md S. Elahee whose telephone number is (571) 272-7536. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 2645

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M.E.

MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE  
August 7, 2005

*Allan Hoosain*  
ALLAN HOOSAIN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
*for*  
*Fan Tseng*